

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1243, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1431) to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) VOLUNTARY ADDITIONS.—Section 4 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) VOLUNTARY ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM.—The Secretary may add any parcel of real property to the System, if—

"(1) the owner of the parcel requests that the Secretary add the parcel to the System; and

"(2) the parcel is a depositional geologic feature described in section 3(1)(A)."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ADDITIONS OF EXCESS PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(d) of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note)—

(A) is redesignated and moved so as to appear as subsection (e) of section 4 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503); and

(B) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "one hundred and eighty" and inserting "180";

(ii) in paragraph (2) by striking "subsection (d)(1)" and inserting "paragraph (1)"; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4(f) of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note) is repealed.

(c) NOTICE REGARDING ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM.—Section 4 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) NOTICE REGARDING ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM.—The Secretary shall—

"(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice of any addition of property to the System under this section, including notice of the availability of a map showing the location of the property;

"(2) provide a copy of that map to the State and local government in which the property is located and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives; and

"(3) revise the maps referred to in subsection (a) to reflect the addition of the property to the System."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)) is amended by striking ", which shall consist of" and all that follows through the end of that subsection and inserting the following: ", that—

"(1) shall consist of those undeveloped coastal barriers and other areas located on the coasts of the United States that are identified and generally depicted on the set of maps on file with the Secretary entitled 'Coastal Barrier Resources System', dated October 24, 1990, as such maps may be modified, revised, corrected, or replaced under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of this section, or any other provision of law enacted on or after November 16, 1990, that specifically authorizes the modification, revision, correction, or replacement; and

"(2) includes areas added to the System in accordance with subsections (d) or (e)."

SEC. 3. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES ACT.—The Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(3) (16 U.S.C. 3502(3)), in the matter following subparagraph (D), by striking "Effective October 1, 1983, such" and inserting "Such"; and

(2) by repealing section 10 (16 U.S.C. 3509).

(b) COASTAL BARRIER IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1990.—Section 8 of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note) is repealed.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 12 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3510) is redesignated as section 10 and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004."

SEC. 5. DIGITAL MAPPING PILOT PROJECT.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO UNDERTAKE PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall undertake a pilot project to determine the feasibility and cost of creating digital versions of the Coastal Barrier Resources System maps referred to in section 4(a)(1) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by this Act. The pilot project shall include the creation of digital maps for at least 5 units of the System.

(2) USE OF EXISTING DATA.—(A) To the extent practicable, in completing the pilot project under this subsection, the Secretary shall use existing digital spatial data including digital orthophotos; shoreline, elevation, and bathymetric data; and electronic navigational charts in the possession of other Federal agencies, including the United States Geological Survey and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(B) The head of any Federal agency that possesses digital spatial data referred to in subparagraph (A) shall promptly provide that data to the Secretary at no cost upon request by the Secretary.

(3) OBTAINING ADDITIONAL DATA.—If the Secretary determines that data necessary to complete the pilot project under this subsection does not exist, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Director of the United States Geological Survey under which the Director shall obtain, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, as appropriate, and provide to the Secretary any dig-

ital spatial data required to carry out this subsection.

(4) DATA STANDARDS.—All digital spatial data used or created to carry out this subsection shall comply with the National Spatial Data Infrastructure established by Executive Order 12906 and any other standards established by the Federal Geographic Data Committee established by the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-16.

(5) DIGITAL MAPS NOT CONTROLLING.—Any determination of whether a location is inside or outside of the System shall be made without regard to the digital maps prepared under this subsection.

(6) REPORT.—(A) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives that describes the results of the pilot project and the feasibility, data needs, and costs of completing digital maps for the entire System.

(B) The report shall include a description of—

(i) the cooperative agreements entered into by the Secretary with other Federal agencies to complete the pilot project and cooperative agreements needed to complete digital mapping of the entire System;

(ii) the availability of existing data to complete digital mapping of the entire System;

(iii) the need for additional data to complete digital mapping of the entire System; and

(iv) the funding needed to complete digital mapping of the entire System.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002 to carry out the pilot project required under this section.

SEC. 6. CORRECTIONS TO MAPS RELATING TO UNIT P19-P.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in subsection (b) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on that map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map relating to unit P19-P entitled "Amendment to the Coastal Barrier Resources System" and dated September 16, 1998.

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that—

(1) is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated November 2, 1994; and

(2) relates to unit P19-P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

SEC. 7. REPLACEMENT OF MAPS RELATING TO UNITS NC-03P AND L03.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 7 maps included in the set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System" and referred to in section 4(a)(1) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by this Act, relating to the portions of Coastal Barrier Resources System units NC-03P and L03 located in Dare County, North Carolina, are hereby replaced by other maps relating to that unit that are entitled "DARE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA, Coastal Barrier Resources System, Cape Hatteras Unit NC-03P" or "DARE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA, Coastal Barrier Resources System, Cape Hatteras Unit NC-03P, Hatteras Island Unit L03" and dated July 1, 1999.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the maps referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with the provisions of section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

SEC. 8. CORRECTIONS TO MAP RELATING TO UNIT DE-03P.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such corrections to the map described in subsection (b) as are necessary to move on that map the boundary of the otherwise protected area (as defined in section 12 of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note; Public Law 101-591)) to the Cape Henlopen State Park boundary to the extent necessary—

(1) to exclude from the otherwise protected area the adjacent property leased, as of the date of enactment of this Act, by the Barcroft Company and Cape Shores Associates (which are privately held corporations under the law of the State of Delaware); and

(2) to include in the otherwise protected area the northwestern corner of Cape Henlopen State Park seaward of the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal.

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that is included in a set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System”, dated October 24, 1990, as revised October 15, 1992, and that relates to the unit of the Coastal Barrier Resources System entitled “Cape Henlopen Unit DE-03P”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congress approved the Coastal Barrier Resources Act in 1982 to protect certain coastal areas by establishing a system of barrier units that are precluded from receiving Federal development assistance.

I introduced H.R. 1431 to reauthorize and improve the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. The system is administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Maps depicting the various units are adopted by Congress and any changes to the boundary systems units require legislative action.

The system was greatly expanded in the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 and now includes 585 system units and 274 otherwise protected areas, covering nearly 1.3 million acres and 1,200 shoreline miles around the Great Lakes, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Gulf of Mexico.

The Coastal Barrier Resources System is unique because it does not regulate or restrict the use of private lands in these coastal barrier areas. Instead, lands within the system are simply not eligible to receive Federal development assistance, including Federal flood insurance. H.R. 1431 would reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources System for 5 years, and it is supported by the

administration. I am aware there is one minor outstanding issue regarding how to depict the boundary of the unit known as L03, and I would like to assure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I remain committed to making these maps as accurate as possible. This minor discrepancy, however, should not hold up the passage of this legislation today; and we will continue to work with the minority to resolve this one issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 1431 addresses the needs of the Coastal Barrier Resources System; and I strongly urge passage of this important environmental legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey Mr. (SAXTON) again, the chairman of Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans for yielding. Let me say from the start, Mr. Speaker, that I very much appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and his staff for working with the minority in shaping this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the minor changes that have been made in the bill since it was reported by the Committee on Resources. Certainly the bill falls short of what I think could be done to strengthen and protect the Coastal Barrier Resources System. Nonetheless, I believe we have effectively eliminated the most problematic provisions to arrive at a fair consensus, and I urge Members of this body to support the bill.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

When Congress passed the Coastal Barriers Act in 1982, it declared that the purpose of the act was to, and I quote, “minimize loss of life, wasteful expenditure of Federal revenues, and the damage to fish, wildlife, and other natural resources associated with coastal barriers by restricting future Federal expenditures and financial assistance which have the effect of encouraging development of coastal barriers.”

Mr. Speaker, this innovative policy has made good sense since 1982, and it continues to make good sense even today. Hurricane Floyd, as we have recently seen, again demonstrates the wisdom and benefits of discouraging development in some of the most dangerous, hazard-prone coastal areas of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, this legislation will begin the long overdue process of modernizing Coastal Barrier Resource System maps. Section 5 of

this bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a pilot study to determine the feasibility and costs of creating a digitized series of Coastal Barrier maps. Current maps were prepared in the 1980s by using primarily color infrared aerial photography and U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle sheets. Hand-rendered delineations of coastal barriers were drawn upon these sheets in order to produce the inventory of coastal barrier maps.

However, Mr. Speaker, major technological advancements such as the new digital spatial data, global positioning systems, computerized geographic information systems, and the new cartographic and survey methods make far greater detail and accuracy now possible. It is essential for the Fish and Wildlife Service to investigate how these new information systems and mapping technologies might enhance the accuracy, usability and transferability of existing coastal barrier maps. We will be looking for the Fish and Wildlife Service to expedite completion of this pilot study as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am, however, disappointed that we were not able to consider more creative ways to increase the amount of undeveloped coastal barriers in the system, and I suspect that the Congress will have to revisit this matter at a later time. This legislation does authorize the voluntary donation of private property for inclusion in the system. However, it remains doubtful that any significant tracts of additional private land will be forthcoming in the absence of any new inducements to encourage donations. Nevertheless, we encourage the Fish and Wildlife Service to pursue aggressively opportunities for donations should they become available.

Mr. Speaker, I am also compelled to express my sense of concern with the inability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete and submit to the Congress a study of undeveloped coastal barriers along the Pacific coast. The Secretary of the Interior was directed in 1990 under section 6 of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act to prepare and submit a study “which examines the need for protecting undeveloped coastal barriers along the Pacific Coast south of 49 degrees north latitude through inclusion in the System.”

The Secretary of the Interior was also directed to “prepare maps identifying the boundaries of those undeveloped coastal barriers of the United States bordering the Pacific Ocean south of 49 degrees north latitude.” All deliverables were to be provided to the Congress not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the 1990 law.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Fish and Wildlife Service has failed to provide Congress with either a final report, or the maps. This 8-year delay is plainly unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. I am greatly

concerned that the pace and growth of the new developments along the Pacific Coast may have significantly reduced the number of coastal areas that meet the section 31 definition of "undeveloped coastal barrier." I urge the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete this directive as soon as possible.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not restate the minority's long-standing concern with the majority's decision to include three other separate technical correction bills as section 6, 7, and 8 in this reauthorization bill. These provisions would change existing boundaries for three different otherwise protected areas in Florida, North Carolina, and Delaware.

Bills of this type are complicated, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, they are not technical corrections in the traditional sense. All of the proposed boundary changes tacked on to this bill deserve close inspection prior to congressional approval. I do appreciate the patience and willingness of the chairman to work with me and the staff on our side to ensure that these proposed changes are given appropriate scrutiny. Yet, even today, we are still awaiting additional information from the Fish and Wildlife Service concerning the boundaries of a coastal barrier unit adjacent to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding from the chairman that we will continue to work in good faith to resolve issues concerning this final boundary. Consequently, we have agreed to move forward with this reauthorization bill at this time. However, should this boundary issue not be resolved to our satisfaction, we do reserve our right to reconsider support of this legislation in conference should the Senate successfully pass a companion bill. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we will find an amicable agreement in this case, but it will remain our preference that all boundary changes be addressed in separate legislation to avoid such circumstances in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will not take long, but just for the record, I would like to say two things. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for his fine and great cooperation in working out what some have seen as difficulties to this bill, and I think that with the one exception that I noted in my opening statement, those difficult issues have been worked out.

I would just like to say secondly for the record that wanting to make sure that we do this on as bipartisan a basis as possible, we endeavored to obtain the support of the United States Department of the Interior and were successful in doing that. Just for the

record, I have a letter here from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Donald Barry, and he was kind enough to answer questions that we posed to him in our letter to him.

For example, for the record we asked, where this map makes changes to the boundaries of the existing OPA, do those changes conform to the boundary of P-19P, to the boundary of the Cayo Costa State Park. This is an important question, because the underlying law required that wherever possible, these boundaries conform to State park boundaries; and his answer is, yes, the new boundary, that is the change in the boundary that is included in this bill, follows the boundary of the Cayo Costa State Park. We asked him, does the Department support the changes made by the map? And the answer is yes, the Department supports the changes to P-19P.

So I will not take the time to go through the other areas of agreement, but the Secretary has indicated broad agreement. Finally, he noted in answer to a question, How many acres are removed from the coastal barrier system, how many are added, what is the net acreage change that results from these boundary changes through the amendments, and his answer, and I will read it in its entirety, "The changes to the three OPAs, North Captiva, Cape Hatteras, and Cape Henlopen, will remove 272 acres from the coastal barrier resources system. The number of acres added, 3,390, and the net change as a result of these amendments is in addition to 3,118 acres to the system."

So I wanted to make sure that was on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I would not want any misunderstanding in this room or among Members of the public that we are removing or in some way denigrating or taking actions that would denigrate the system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I identify with many of the comments the gentleman made in his initial comments. However, I have some reluctance in having us come forward with this proposal today. The backdrop of the hurricane that is taking place, the devastation that is going up and down the East Coast, and we are taking a critical piece of legislation, the coastal barrier resources system, where we should be looking at ways to strengthen the legislation. We should be looking at areas to add land that are protected, and instead, we revisiting it again on a piecemeal basis, adding additional land, in some cases in dispute. I am sorry, it may be that it is flooded and we cannot find where it is. I find a great deal of irony that we would be

having this today, not even being able to know what it is precisely that we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of environmental legislation that came forward in the Reagan administration. It was focused on making sure that the federal taxpayer was not subsidizing inappropriate development. I am one that feels that it is entirely appropriate for government on the State, federal, and local level to perhaps exercise a little more discretion about where we do permit and encourage development. But at a minimum, the federal taxpayer ought not to be in a position of subsidizing development that is environmentally not sound.

We are whittling away, bit by bit, pulling land out of this. We do not have clear and convincing criteria to guide what is going on. It seems to me that this is again wildly inappropriate, given the backdrop of what is going on to serve as a reason for why we should insist that this be done properly. We ought not to have a series of confusing directives from the Fish and Wildlife Service, something that is submitted to potential political manipulation. We should be strengthening this system today, adding integrity to the decision-making process, by having Congress codify the development criteria into law, once and for all. And we ought to be very clear that we know exactly what we are voting on, especially when this is coming forward on a suspension calendar.

With all due respect, I do not feel comfortable moving forward like this. I feel very strongly that it is time to be evaluating the West Coast lands for inclusion. It has been trapped in limbo now for years. We should be as a Congress moving forward with the administration to make sure that we are not having inappropriate federal subsidies for development on the West Coast lands, along with other remaining undeveloped coastal barriers among the East, the Gulf and the Great Lakes region.

Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating for me when I think Congress has a role to be a good partner with the private sector, with State and local governments, to make sure that we are promoting sound environmental developments and livable communities. I am frustrated that the Federal Government is aiding and abetting some of the disaster that we are seeing right now in the Carolinas because we have not had a thoughtful approach frankly to our flood insurance; and we give money to people who are repeatedly flooded out of areas and they move back in. This is another example of where we are not taking advantage of a comprehensive approach.

With all due respect, I would urge that this legislation not move forward today, that we come forward with a comprehensive approach to the system,

that we deal with the West Coast that is in limbo, and for heaven's sakes, we do not come forward with areas to withdraw additional land when we do not know what we are talking about and we are hoping that something is going to be taken care of in a never, never land in a conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge rejection of the proposal before us today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise with concerns on this bill. It is obviously a very smart idea. Congress decided to set aside resources along the coastal areas, the barriers and said look, it does not make any sense for us to put a lot of federal aid in there like flood insurance for the private developers to go in and develop and then come back and ask that the risk for development in these highly sensitive areas should be borne by the general taxpayer.

□ 1530

So we set aside these resources, and we asked the Department of the Interior to draw the maps for us, and those maps yet have not been completed. At the same time, people who have developed, because one can develop in the barrier areas privately, but with that private development they also have private risk, not federally-supported risk. So people are coming in and saying, we are developed now. Now we want to back out of the barrier area because we want this Federal flood insurance and coastal protection kinds of issues, where Federal money comes in.

We ought to stick to our guns of the original intention, that there are sensitive areas on the coast of the United States of America, including Alaska, that should not be developed. We ought not to give resources to encourage development along those zones. The Act does not buy the land, it says people can put their land in voluntarily.

The problem is, when we get to dealing with it, really they have been short on anything on the Pacific coast, where the majority of the population lives. So in 1990, the Secretary of the Interior directed Congress to map the boundaries of undeveloped coastal areas along the Pacific coast south of 49 degrees latitude, and to examine the need for protecting these areas. Yet, 9 years later we do not even have the final maps.

So this bill is well-intentioned and has been brought to the floor for good reasons, but it certainly raises a lot of concerns that Members are hearing from us today. I just commend the chairman of the committee because he is in a tough position. I appreciate the politics that he has had and that he has been able to bring these coastal zone

bill to the floor. I hope the rest of them can come, as well.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say basically, in response to my good friends, the gentlemen from Oregon and California, with regard to their concerns on this legislation, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), our chairman, that we have worked very, very closely in trying to alleviate some of the problems and concerns that the Members have addressed earlier.

I think the situation for us to bear in mind is that we have to start somewhere. The fact is that 10 years ago, the technology and getting the proper mappings, maybe it needs putting a little stronger wording in the language of the legislation to get the Fish and Wildlife Service to be responsive to the concerns that we have here in the Congress.

I think as a whole the legislation should move forward. I think at the proper time in conference if the concerns are still not addressed, certainly the chairman is very sensitive to this issue, and I, for one, would certainly like to see that legislation pass.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just try to answer some questions that were raised, or at least respond to them.

Subsequent to the original legislation which passed in 1982, the Department of the Interior was charged with the responsibility that can generally be described as mapping, and to set aside areas to be included in the system.

As one might expect, because the people who were doing the mapping were human beings, there was perhaps less precision with the original mapping than there might have been.

Frankly, all this bill does as far as this part of the activity is concerned, or as far as this part of the language in the bill is concerned, is to try to correct some mistakes that were made subsequent to the 1982 bill, during the mapping process. In making those corrections, we were actually adding over 3,000 acres to the system, not removing. We are adding over 3,000 acres to the system, while removing only approximately 270 that were included as an error.

So I share with my friends the desire to strengthen the system, but a system that has incorrect lines in it, incorrect areas included and areas that have not been included that should have been included, is not a system with a lot of integrity. So I thank the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for understanding this, and for agreeing to and having demonstrated the ability to work with me and our staffs

together and with the Department of the Interior to make these corrections. So again, I want to emphasize how important I think this is.

Mr. Speaker, some of us spend a lot of time around the water, some of us spend a lot of time on the water. Some of us have for years and years been distressed by the high rate of development in coastal areas.

We are currently attempting to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act, and that act is intended to, among other things, protect, enhance coastal areas, and in almost every instance, by slowing down growth.

I can remember 35 years ago sailing, and all Members who are here know that Barnegat Bay is in my district, I can remember many years ago beginning at the top of Barnegat Bay, the north end, and sailing south, and looking to my right and left and seeing a few houses dotting the skyline here and there, but by and large a lot of greenery. That was 35 years ago. I would love to take Members on the same trip today and let them look to the right and left and see the houses and the commercial establishments and the restaurants.

Certainly this bill and the provisions in it and the history of it have been a very important part of protecting those open space areas, wetlands, and other types of habitat that are so important to coastal areas. So while we are trying to carry out our very important objectives, while we are trying to put in place Federal, State and local policy that makes sense in terms of protecting the environmental integrity of these areas, where inconsistencies and mistakes are found, they need to be corrected. Those corrections are what have caused the concern on the part of some of the previous speakers.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I do want to commend my good friends, the gentlemen from Oregon and from California, for giving their expressions of concern to the legislation, especially coming from Pacific coastal States like Oregon and California.

But I want to assure my good friends that the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), is very conscious and very understanding of the situation, and Members will note also that the committee report points out those very concerns that we have.

But at the same time, I want to say to my friends from Oregon and California that our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) nevertheless would like to see this legislation move forward, and that at

an appropriate time, if things still are not being able to be worked out, both with the majority as well as with the administration, then of course we will not have the legislation.

But I think the most difficult situation for us to consider now is that we have to start somewhere. If, rather, the option is that we kill this bill, then we might not have any legislation at all. I think that would be a terrible situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respectfully ask my colleagues to support this bill, given the reservations expressed in the committee report. It does have the support of the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), and other members of this committee. I would like to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1431 reauthorizes the Coastal Barrier Resources Act for five years and corrects mapping errors in three units of the System.

The Coastal Barrier Resources System prohibits Federal development assistance on undeveloped coastal barriers and it is a sound natural resource management policy. The Act does not prohibit private development on private lands. However, it requires the landowner, not the Federal Government, to shoulder the burden of cost and assume the risks when developing dynamic barrier islands.

Regrettably, the Federal Government has been known to make mistakes from time to time. This is the case with the System units that are addressed in H.R. 1431. Three otherwise protected areas—one in Florida, one in Delaware, and one in North Carolina—were mapped incorrectly when these units were created in 1990. At the time these otherwise protected areas were delineated, the Fish and Wildlife Service incorrectly included private lands that were not held for conservation purposes into the otherwise protected areas, in direct contradiction to the intent of the Act. This mistake effectively cut off Federal flood insurance for many existing homes. Similarly, the 1990 maps did not include all of the public lands that should have been included in the otherwise protected areas. H.R. 1431 makes changes to the maps to reflect the true boundaries of the underlying conservation areas, and it results in a net addition of more than 2,000 acres for the System.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which will correct mapping errors that have adversely affected several private landowners for nearly a decade.

H.R. 1431 is a good bill and I urge an aye vote.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1431, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1431, the bill just debated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST LANDS TO ELKO COUNTY, NEVADA

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1231) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS TO ELKO COUNTY, NEVADA, FOR USE AS CEMETERY.

(a) *REQUIREMENT TO CONVEY.*—The Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without consideration, to Elko County, Nevada, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in subsection (b).

(b) *DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The property referred to in subsection (a) consists of (A) a parcel of National Forest lands (including any improvements thereon) in Elko County, Nevada, known as Jarbidge Cemetery, consisting of approximately 2 acres within the following described lands: NE¼ SW¼ NW¼, S. 9 T. 46 N, R. 58 E., MDB&M, which shall be used as a cemetery; and (B) the existing bridge over the Jarbidge River that provides access to that parcel, and the road from the bridge to the parcel as depicted on the map entitled 'Elko County Road and Bridge Conveyance' dated July 27, 1999.

(2) *SURVEY.*—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. As a condition of any conveyance under this section, the Secretary shall require that the cost of the survey shall be borne by the County.

(c) *ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, except that the Secretary may not retain for the United States any reversionary interest in property conveyed under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the

gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) to talk about the bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to support the bill, H.R. 1231. This bill will convey two small acres of land, of Forest Service land to Elko, Nevada for the permanent and continued use as a cemetery.

The cemetery is located in Jarbidge, Nevada, a small rural community in Elko County. Known historically for its contribution to Nevada's mining industry, this community is surrounded by National Forest Service lands and the Jarbidge Wilderness Area.

Within this vast public land is a small cemetery under the administration of the Forest Service where generation after generation of residents of this historic mining community have been laid to rest. The earliest tombstones, Mr. Speaker, are dated in the very early 1900s, and some members of the Jarbidge community claim this land was used as a cemetery long before it was designated as Forest Service land.

Since 1915, the Jarbidge Cemetery has been operated under a permit to Elko County by a special use authorization, which runs periodically for 10 and occasionally 20 years. In an effort to remove the uncertainty about the continued existence of this cemetery and to resolve the operational responsibilities, the residents of Jarbidge have long expressed an interest in having the cemetery conveyed to the county so they might have a permanent and private cemetery. This is why I introduced H.R. 1231.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to understand that the residents are asking for conveyance of this land because they, and I would agree, and I think it is reasonable, feel that it is not right to pay for the graves of Nevada's parents and grandparents. Many of those buried at Jarbidge are miners and their families, and in fact are the founders of the small Elko County community.

Given the hundreds of thousands of acres administered by the Forest Service in this region and their oversight of the Jarbidge wilderness area, the conveyance of two acres for the purpose of allowing the residents to privately own the resting place of their relatives seems to be both rational and fair, keeping in mind, of course, that we are talking about a cemetery, the final resting place for people, the Nevadans and their loved ones.

Furthermore, I believe that it is our government's civic duty, the duty to do what is right on behalf of the American